

**REMARKS**

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated December 1, 2004 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24, 25, 29, and 31 have been amended. Claims 1-31 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Initially, the Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that original claims 3, 4, 13-18, 21, and 23-31 include allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 5-12, 19, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,182,460 to *Hernandez et al.* (hereinafter “*Hernandez*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” However, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Hernandez* does not teach every element recited in claims 1, 2, 5-12, 19, 20, and 22. Thus, *Hernandez* cannot anticipate these claims.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3. Thus, claim 1 and claim 2, which depends from claim 1, are allowable over *Hernandez* and the Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 5 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 17 as shown above. Accordingly, the Applicants request that the rejection of claim 5 and claims 6-12, which depend from claim 5, be withdrawn.

Claim 19 is not anticipated by *Hernandez*. In particular, claim 19 recites a unit type air conditioner comprising, among other features, “a discharge frame having grill parts disposed at opposite sides of the discharge frame” and “a discharge grill between the grill parts for

controlling an air flow direction.” *Hernandez* does not disclose these features. While *Hernandez* discloses an air discharging assembly 20, as may be seen in Figures 1 and 2 of *Hernandez*, the discharging assembly 20 does not include “a discharge frame having grill parts disposed at opposite sides of the discharge frame” and “a discharge grill between the grill parts for controlling an air flow direction” as recited in claim 19. At most, as *Hernandez* clearly shows in Figure 2, the discharging assembly 20 contains a single, unitary piece. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Hernandez* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 19 and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 20, which depends from claim 19, is also patentable for at least the same reasons.


Claim 22, as amended, is also allowable over *Hernandez*. More particularly, as noted above, claim 22 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 24. Therefore, the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicants believe the application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant